



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/672,945
Filing Date: September 29, 2003
Appellant(s): PASQUALI, SANDRO

Michael J. Strauss
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 1/8/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 1/8/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The brief lists the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", Sams.net, 1996

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Double Patenting

1. Claims 1-47 are temporarily rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, as indicated below, pending approval of terminal disclaimer.
2. The rejections of claims 1-43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-11, 1, 1, 1, 11, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, 2, and 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,658,419 B2**, that of claims (6 –attributes-- and 16--attribute), 16, 16, 16, 10-11, 16, 16, 16, 16, 5, 1, 1, 3, 16, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, and 1, of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,535,882 B2, hereinafter 882**, claims 1-13, 1, 1, 11, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, 2, 1, and 11 of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,272,493 B1, hereinafter 493**, have been withdrawn due to the similarity, but not equality in the both the instant application and the claims in the patents above.
3. The rejections of claims 1-47 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable based on similar grounds as those of claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over U.S. Patent No. **6,321,209 B1, hereinafter 209**, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the terminal disclaimer filed on 7/6/2006

Art Unit: 2178

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-3, 6-11, 14-22, 24-32, and 35-47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, except for claims 45-46 directed towards claims 5-8 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,636,856 B2, hereinafter 856**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 856 patent.

6. Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 13-23, 25, 29-34, 40, 43, and 47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims, 1, 1, 1, 17, 1, 18, 13, 1, 1, 1-5, 7, 18, 13, 1-5, 1, 1, and 13 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,434,563 B1, hereinafter 563**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably

distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 563 patent.

7. Claims 1-11, and 14-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11, 1, 1, 1, 11, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, 2, and 1 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,658,419 B2**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 419 patent.

8. Claims 1-11, 14-18, 19-29, 30-39, and 40-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims (6 --attributes-- and 16--attribute), 16, 16, 16, 10-11, 16, 16, 16, 16, 5, 1, 1, 3, 16, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, and 1, respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,535,882 B2, hereinafter 882**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 882 patent.

9. Claims 1-43, and 46-47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13, 1, 1, 11, 1-11, 1-10, 1, 6, 6, 2, 1, and 11 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,272,493 B1, hereinafter 493**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 856 patent.

10. Claims 1-3, 6-11, 14-22, 24-32, and 35-47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, except for claims 45-46, which are directed towards claims 5-8 respectively of prior U.S. Patent No. **6,636,856 B2**, **hereinafter 856**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are contained in the claims of the 856 patent.

11. Claims 12-13, and 44-45 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. **6,658,419 B2**, hereinafter 419, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, 419 fails to teach *the window object is a tiled window object*. Javascript discloses tiling the frames within a web browser (pages 172-175, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 419, and Javascript, because Javascript teaches creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, 419 fails to teach *the window object is a draggable window object*. Javascript discloses a window bar for dragging frames(implied) placed within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to combine 419, and Javascript, because Javascript teaches creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 40, 419 fails to teach *instructions are HTML*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages, written in HTML, frame windows using the script on the web browser (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 419, and Javascript, because Javascript teaches creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 40, 419 fails to teach *instructions are Javascript*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using Javascript on the web browser-- (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 419, and Javascript, because Javascript teaches creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

12. Claims 12-13, and 44-47 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of 882, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, 882 fails to teach *the window object is a tiled window object*. Javascript discloses tiling the frames within a web browser (pages 172-175, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, 882 fails to teach *the window object is a draggable window object*. Javascript discloses a window bar for dragging frames(implied) placed within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 419, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 40, 882 fails to teach *instructions are HTML*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages, written in HTML, frame windows using the script on the web browser (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 40, 882 fails to teach *instructions are Javascript*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using Javascript on the web browser-- (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 46, which depends on claim 40, 882 fails to teach *instruction package is received by said client system and the web browser client after the web browser client accesses a web site via the electronic data network, said web site serving said instruction package*. Javascript discloses a client entering an url into a browser, and as a result a server transmit to a browser a web page. The browser outputs or displays web pages frame windows using the scripted web page sent by the server (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 47, which depends on claim 40, 882 fails to teach *instruction package is intended to be served to said client over the Internet*. Javascript discloses a client entering an url into a browser, and as a result a server transmit to a browser a web page. The browser outputs or

Art Unit: 2178

displays web pages frame windows using the scripted web page sent by the server (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 882, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

13. Claims 44-45 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of 493, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 40, 493 fails to teach *instructions are HTML*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages, written in HTML, frame windows using the script on the web browser (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 493, and Javascript for all the reasons outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 40, 493 fails to teach *instructions are Javascript*. Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using Javascript on the web browser-- (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine 493, and Javascript for all the reasons

outlined by Javascript, such as creating multiwindow documents that interact with each other in new ways (page 180, parag. 4-5). This makes it easier to view multiple documents at the same time.

14. Claims 44-45 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of **493**, in view of Lemay et al, “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop JavaScript”, hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

15. Claims 1-47 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over claim 2 of U.S. Application No. **09/838,927, hereinafter 927**, in view of Lemay et al, “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop JavaScript”, hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

16. Claims 1-47 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over claim 2 of U.S. Application No. **09/859,928, hereinafter 928**, in view of Lemay et al, “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop JavaScript”, hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

17. Claims 1-47 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over claim 6 of U.S. Application No. **10/175,675, hereinafter 675**, “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop JavaScript”, hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

18. Claims 1-47 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 in this office action (3/1/06) over claim 6 of U.S. Application No. **11/188,764, hereinafter 764**, in view of Lemay et al, “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop JavaScript”, hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

19. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

20. Claims 1-47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lemay et al, “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop JavaScript”, hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pp.10-11, 172-186.

Regarding independent claim 1, Javascript discloses a server sending back to a browser, the contents of a web page, which includes a script (page 11, listing 1.2)-- *a server system configured to transmit a software system and associated content via an electronic data network; and a web browser client operating within a data processing system that is coupled to said server system via the electronic data network and having a content manifestation environment, said web browser client operative to receive said software system and said associated content via said server system.*

Furthermore, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows using the script. The script contains editable tags and attributes that define the frame windows (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173)-- *to process said software system and said associated content to produce at least one window object within said content manifestation environment, said at least one window object associated with a set of controllable attributes and configured to manifest at least a portion of said associated content therein, said controllable attributes configured to affect manifestation of said at least one window object by said web browser client within said content manifestation environment..*

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows on a browser using the script (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173)-- *window object executes within said web browser client which operates within said data processing system.*

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows on a browser using the script (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173)-- *window object executes within said web browser client which operates within said data processing system.*

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows on a browser using an entered url (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses replacing ads every few seconds on a browser window (pages 227-229).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses replacing—*not refreshed within client*-- ads every few seconds on a browser window (pages 227-229).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses moving the dividing lines of frames within a web browser (page 173, parag.1).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses resizing frames within a web browser (page 173, parag.1).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses a minimize button for minimizing frames within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses a maximize button for maximizing frames within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows on a browser using an entered url—*over the Internet* (page 10, last parag. page 11).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses tiling the frames within a web browser (pages 172-175, fig.9.1-9.2).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses a window bar for dragging frames(implied) placed within a web browser (page 172, fig.9.1).

Claim 14-15 are directed towards a network client for implementing the system found in claim 1, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 14, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows using the script on the web browser. The script contains editable tags and attributes that define the frame windows (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 14, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows using the script on the web browser. The script contains editable tags and attributes that define the frame windows (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 14, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows using the script on the web browser of the document received from the web server. The script contains editable tags and attributes that define the frame windows (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Claims 19-29 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1-11 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 30-39 are directed towards a network client for implementing the system found in claims 1-10 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 40-42 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1, 6, and 6, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 43, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using the script on the web browser-- *content manifestation environment corresponds to a screen environment maintained by said client system* (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages, written in HTML, frame windows using the script on the web browser (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses outputting or displaying web pages frame windows using Javascript on the web browser-- (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 46, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses a client entering an url into a browser, and as a result a server transmit to a browser a web page. The browser outputs or displays web pages frame windows using the scripted web page sent by the server--
instruction package is received by said client system and the web browser client after the web browser client accesses a web site via the electronic data network, said web site serving said instruction package (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2)

Regarding claim 47, which depends on claim 40, Javascript discloses a client entering an url into a browser, and as a result a server transmit to a browser a web page. The browser outputs or displays web pages frame windows using the scripted web page sent by the server—*said instruction package is intended to be served to said client system via the Internet* (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173, fig.9.1-9.2).

(10) Response to Argument

Regarding claim 1, the Appellant states that Lemay does not describe the production of a window object within a content manifestation environment (page 15, last parag.). The Examiner disagrees because Javascript teaches the display of window frames in a browser (page 11, 172-173, listing1.2). The frame objects are generated and displayed within the browser, thus manifesting the webpages framed by the frame objects. It is the Examiners view, that window objects do not necessarily mean ‘windows’, but they are interpreted to mean objects of a window.

Regarding claim 14, the Appellant states that it is well-known that Javascript does not require the use of frames in each script written by a developer (page 16). It is the understanding of the Examiner that Javascript teaches the limitation in question, because the frames are produced within the browser view or manifestation as indicated above.

Claims 19, 30, and 40 stand rejected at least for the reasons shown above.

Regarding claims 2, 20, and 31, and in response to Appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of Appellant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which Appellant relies (i.e., ‘the mere capability to script frames is not the same as producing at least one frame in each script’ page 17) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the

Art Unit: 2178

claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Javascript teaches displaying the frames within the browser display (pages 11, 172-173, listing 1.2). The frames are executed within the browser to provide data separation.

Claims 3-5, 21-23, and 32-34 stand rejected at least for the reasons shown above.

Regarding claims 6, 24, and 35, and in response to Appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of Appellant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which Appellant relies (i.e., Javascript does not require the use of frames that are automatically refreshed in each script written by a developer (page 19)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). However, Javascript teaches the rotation, and display of various ad banners within the browser (pages 227-228). It is important to note that the banners are rotated or refreshed and not the entire content displayed in the browser.

Regarding claims 7, 25, and 36, the Appellant indicates that Javascript does not teach moveable windows (page 20). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript teaches moving the frames within the browser window (page 173, parag.1).

Regarding claims 8, 26, and 37, the Appellant indicates that Javascript does not teach resizeable window objects (page 20). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript teaches moving the frames within the browser window (page 173, parag.1), thereby resizing the frame objects.

Regarding claims 9, 27, and 38, the Appellant indicates that Javascript does not teach minimizing window objects (page 21). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript teaches minimizing the frames within the browser window using a minimizing button (page 172, fig.9.1).

Regarding claims 10, 28, and 39, the Appellant indicates that Javascript does not teach maximizing window objects (page 21). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript teaches maximizing the frames within the browser window using a maximizing button (page 172, fig.9.1).

Regarding claims 11, 18, 29, and 47, the Appellant indicates that Javascript does not teach a window object that executes within a web browser and data is transmitted over the Internet (page 22). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript teaches displaying frames in a browser by requesting a webpage from a webserver—over the Internet (page 10, last parag.-page 11).

Regarding claim 12, the Appellant indicates that Javascript does not teach the tiling of window objects (page 22). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript teaches displaying the frames within the browser window in such a way as to tile the content of the webpage(s) (pages 172-175, fig.9.1-9.2).

Regarding claim 13, the Appellant indicates that Javascript does not teach the dragging of at least one window object (page 23). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript teaches

Art Unit: 2178

displaying window bar on the web browser window (page 172, fig.9.1). The bar would allow a user to drag the browser window along with the frames.

Regarding claims 15-16, the Appellant indicates that Javascript does not teach 'wherein said processing engine being further configured to process said content to produce a control section and a content display section within said at least one window object, said content display section configured to at least a portion of said content therein, said control section including a set of controls corresponding to a set of attributes which operate to affect manifestation of said at least one window object and at least a portion of said content within said content display section' (page 23). The Examiner disagrees, Javascript discloses outputting web pages frame windows using the script. The script contains editable tags and attributes that define the frame windows (page 11, listing 1.2, pages 172-173). The frames are used for dividing the webpage content displayed on the browser.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Conclusion

For all of the reasons stated above the Examiner believes that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

<p>/CESAR B PAULA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178 March 31, 2008</p>

Stephen Hong, SPE 2178
SH(conf.)
/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Doug Hutton, SPE 2176
DH(conf.)

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100